## Case 2:23-cv-01939-WBS-AC Document 18-1 Filed 10/06/23 Page 1 of 3

<ol> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>4</li> </ol>	CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP JOEL KURTZBERG (admitted pro ha FLOYD ABRAMS (admitted pro hac JASON ROZBRUCH (admitted pro hac LISA J. COLE (admitted pro hac 32 Old Slip New York, New York 10005	vice) c vice)
5	Telephone: 212-701-3120 Facsimile: 212-269-5420 jkurtzberg@cahill.com	
<ul><li>6</li><li>7</li><li>8</li><li>9</li></ul>	DOWNEY BRAND LLP WILLIAM R. WARNE (Bar No. 14128 bwarne@downeybrand.com MEGHAN M. BAKER (Bar No. 243765 mbaker@downeybrand.com 621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor	
10	Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: 916-444-1000 Facsimile: 916-520-5910	
11 12	Attorneys for Plaintiff X Corp.	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SACRAMENTO DIVISION	
16		
17	X CORP.,	No. 2:23-cv-01939-WBS-AC
18	Plaintiff,	
19	v.	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
20 21	ROBERT A. BONTA, Attorney General of California, in his	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
22	official capacity,	
23	Defendant.	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

2.1

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Upon consideration of the Motion and all briefs and supporting papers and in accordance with Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court concludes that the Motion should be granted and a preliminary injunction shall remain in effect during the pendency of this litigation.

Defendant Attorney General Robert Bonta, in his official capacity, is charged with enforcing Assembly Bill 587 ("AB 587"), which is codified in California Business Code Chapter 22.8, entitled Content Moderation Requirements for Internet Terms of Service, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22675-22681. Plaintiff X Corp. is a social media company governed by AB 587.

Plaintiff has evidenced a colorable claim that AB 587 violates the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 2, of the California Constitution by compelling X Corp. to speak about its moderation of hate speech, racism, extremism, radicalization, disinformation, misinformation, harassment, and foreign political interference; impermissibly interferes with the constitutionally-protected editorial judgments of X Corp.; has both the purpose and likely effect of pressuring social media companies, such as X Corp., to restrict, remove, demonetize, or deprioritize constitutionally-protected speech that the State deems undesirable or harmful; and places an unjustified and undue burden on social media companies, such as X Corp. Plaintiff has also established a likelihood of success that AB 587, due to its imposition of civil penalties, conflicts with, and is thus preempted by, 47 U.S.C. § 230.

Plaintiff has established it will likely suffer irreparable

## Case 2:23-cv-01939-WBS-AC Document 18-1 Filed 10/06/23 Page 3 of 3

1	harm if AB 587 is not enjoined, and that the balance of equities		
2	and public interest favor an injunction. Thus, the Court will		
3	grant Plaintiff's request to enjoin AB 587.		
4	It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for		
5	Preliminary Injunction be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.		
6	Pending final resolution of this action, Defendant, his agents and		
7	employees, all persons or entities in privity with them, and anyone		
8	acting in concert with them, are hereby ENJOINED from enforcing AB		
9	587 against Plaintiff.		
10			
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
12			
13	DATED:		
14	Honorable William B. Shubb United States District Judge		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

28